

REMARKS

In response to the final office action of November 21, 2005, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks. This amendment is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination.

Claims 1-12, 19, 20, 31-35, and 39-43 are now pending, of which claims 1, 7, 31, 39, and 43 are independent. Claims 1-12, 19, 20, 31-35, and 39-42 have been amended, claims 22-30 and 36-38 have been canceled, and claim 43 has been added. Support for these amendments may be found in the application at, for example, page 10, line 11 to page 11, line 2. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that the objection to the drawings may be held in abeyance until the claims of this application have been held to be allowable.

Rejection of Claims 1-20 and 22-25 under Section 103

Claims 1-20 and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Glass (U.S. Patent No. 6,253,204) in view of Nakao (U.S. Patent No. 6,061,697). Claims 13-18 and 22-25 have been cancelled in this amendment. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because neither Glass nor Nakao describe or suggest the subject matter of the amended independent claims 1 and 7, as described more fully below.

Amended claim 1 recites a network client that has instructions embodied in computer-readable medium that, when executed, cause a processor to manifest content received over a network of computers. The network client includes a scanner component, a parsing component and a replaceable document type definition component. The scanner component is configured to access an input content stream representing at least a layout source document via a network connection to extract renderable content from the layout source document, where the renderable content is associated with at least one particular grammar. The parsing component is coupled to the scanner component and is configured to parse the renderable content and determine whether the renderable content includes one or more malformed expressions. The replaceable document type definition component is configured to, based on a determination that the renderable content includes a malformed expression, select a particular layout document type definition for the renderable content from among multiple layout document type definitions, the particular layout

document type definition corresponding to the at least one particular grammar. The replaceable document type definition is also configured to control the parsing component to parse the renderable content based on the particular layout document type definition to transform at least one of the malformed expressions included in the renderable content to a well-formed expression capable of being rendered.

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because neither Glass nor Nakao disclose or suggest at least the feature of selecting, based on a determination that the renderable content includes malformed expressions, a particular layout document type definition for the renderable content from among multiple layout document type definitions, where the particular layout document type definition corresponding to the at least one particular grammar.

Specifically, Glass discloses modifying the display of a website that includes a broken link. See Glass at col. 1, lines 32-45. To modify the appearance of the broken link, the code for the website that has the broken link is retrieved and is modified by changing the mark-up language utilized for the website. See id. As such, Glass discloses changing the appearance of broken links included in a web page. Glass does not describe or suggest selecting a particular layout document type definition for the renderable content from among multiple layout document type definitions, as recited in amended claim 1.

In contrast to the language of amended claim 1, Nakao discloses a SGML document managing apparatus that allows users to collaboratively create, edit, and use SGML documents. See Nakao at col. 6, lines 35-39. In particular, a portion of a document can be edited independently with another editing work. See Nakao at col. 10, lines 51-52. To ensure independence of partial editing, a partial editing DTD is created for the SGML document. See Nakao at col. 10, lines 62-67. The partial editing DTD is created by adding or modifying occurrence indicators included in the DTD of the SGML document. See Nakao at col. 12, lines 10-41. When a client requests access to the SGML document, the partial editing DTD is supplied to the client. See Nakao at col. 17, line 66-col. 18, line 1. The system of Nakao supplies the partial editing DTD to the client and does not describe or suggest selecting the partial editing DTD from among multiple DTDs. Thus, Nakao does not describe or suggest selecting a particular layout document type definition for the renderable content from among multiple layout document type definitions, much less doing so based on a determination that renderable content includes a malformed expression, as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Glass, Nakao, and any proper combination of the references does not describe or suggest selecting, based on a determination that the renderable content includes malformed expressions, a particular layout document type definition for the renderable content from among multiple layout document type definitions, where the particular layout document type definition corresponds to the at least one particular grammar, as recited in amended claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of amended independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6, 19, and 20.

Similarly to claim 1, independent claim 7 recites selecting, based on a determination that the renderable content includes malformed expressions, a particular layout document type definition for the renderable content from among multiple layout document type definitions, the particular layout document type definition corresponding to the at least one particular grammar.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of amended independent claim 7 and an its dependent claims 8-12.

Rejection of Claims 31-35 and 37-42 under Section 103

Claims 31-35 and 37-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sato (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,680) in view of Nakao. Claims 37 and 38 have been cancelled in this amendment. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 31-35 and 39-42 because Sato, Nakao or any proper combination of the references do not describe or suggest the subject matter of amended independent claims 31 and 39, as described more fully below.

Amended claim 31 recites a network client that includes, inter alia, a document type definition component configured to dynamically select a replaceable document type definition from among multiple replaceable document type definitions and provide the replaceable document type definition to the parsing engine.

In contrast, Sato discloses a method of generating a structured document from a non-structured document. See Sato at col. 7, lines 38-44. In particular, a keyword extraction module separates the non-structured document into keywords and other strings and a parsing module performs a parsing process described in a parsing rule to analyze the document structure. See Sato at col. 7, lines 46-54. In generating the parsing rule, a correcting module modifies a

standard document type definition (DTD) to generate a modified DTD and a parsing rule generating module utilizes the modified DTD to generate the parsing rule. See Sato at col. 7, lines 58-col. 8, line 2. As such, Sato modifies a DTD to generate another DTD. Sato, however, does not describe or suggest selecting a particular layout document type definition for the renderable content from among multiple layout document type definitions.

Accordingly, Sato does not describe or suggest dynamically selecting a replaceable document type definition from among multiple replaceable document type definitions, as recited in amended claim 31.

As discussed above, Nakao does not describe or suggest selecting, based on a determination that the renderable content includes malformed expressions, a particular layout document type definition for the renderable content from among multiple layout document type definitions, where the particular layout document type definition corresponds to the at least one particular grammar. Nor does Nakao describe or suggest dynamically selecting a replaceable document type definition from among multiple replaceable document type definitions, as recited in amended claim 31.

Accordingly, Sato, Nakao, or any proper combination of the references does not describe or suggest dynamically selecting a replaceable document type definition from among multiple replaceable document type definitions, as recited in amended claim 31.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of amended independent claim 31 and its dependent claims 32-35.

New Claim 43

New claim 43 recites a system for manifesting content received over a network of computers. The system includes, inter alia, means for determining whether the renderable content includes one or more malformed expressions and means for selecting, based on a determination that the renderable content includes a malformed expression, a particular layout document type definition for the renderable content from among multiple layout document type definitions, the particular layout document type definition corresponding to the at least one particular grammar.

For at least the reasons noted above with respect to claims 1 and 31, Applicant submits claim 43 is allowable.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.136, applicant hereby petitions that the period for response to the action dated November 21, 2005, be extended for two months to and including April 21, 2006.

The fee in the amount of \$1240.00 in payment of the Request for Continued Examination fee (\$790) and the two-month extension of time fee (\$450) is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 21, 2006



Barbara A. Benoit
Reg. No. 54,777

Customer No.: 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331